<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 15 and 20 have been previously canceled. As such, claims 1, 2, 5-11, 14 and 16-19 are in this application and are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0202541 published October 30, 2003 for Lim et al. (*Lim*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0117979 published June 26, 2003 for Chitrapu (*Chitrapu*). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The combination of *Lim* and *Chitrapu* <u>does not yield</u> Applicants' claimed invention. The plain language of Applicants' independent claims 1 and 14 is clear. A peak correlation value is associated with the first synchronization value (slot synchronization). This peak correlation value is then used <u>to determine a number</u>. This number is <u>the number of frames to process the second synchronization channel to acquire **frame synchronization**</u>.

The Examiner's cited portions of *Lim* simply refer to correlation values and acquiring slot synchronization. There is no description in *Lim* that a correlation value from the slot synchronization is used to determine a number as claimed by Applicants. Indeed, *Lim* simply states that:

> [t]herefore, it is possible to acquire information on a code group, i.e., a Node B group, where the UE belongs, and information on frame synchronization by receiving a secondary synchronization channel signal for a period of several time slots, <u>correlating secondary synchronization codes with a secondary channel signal for the period of several time slots</u>, and performing a cyclic shift operation on each of the 64 codewords 15 times. The term "frame synchronization" means synchronization on timing or phase within one period of a scrambling spreading code for a spread spectrum system. In the existing W-CDMA mobile communication system, one period of a spreading code

and a length of a frame are both 10 ms, so this is called "frame synchronization."

Lim, paragraph [0015], emphasis added.

Nowhere does the above-cited portion of *Lim* describe that a number was derived from the slot synchronization for determining the number of frames for acquiring frame synchronization as claimed by Applicants. *Lim* simply describes to use a period of several time slots for frame synchronization. There is no description, or suggestion, in *Lim* of determining a number to use during frame synchronization as a function of a correlation value from slot synchronization as claimed by Applicants.

Similar comments apply to *Chitrapu*. Indeed, *Chitrapu* states:

The results of the SSC correlations for each frame are accumulated until a confidence level is determined using a rule based approach, (74). Factors considered in the confidence level determination are the received magnitude and shape factor of each SSC, the variation in each received SSCs magnitude and shape between frames and the allowed SSC combinations. Additionally, information from previous successful cell synchronizations may be included, (75). The previous information may contain the previously detected SSCs at a given frame location. If SSC codes are detected at a location associated with a prior successful synchronization, the confidence in the SSC detection is increased.

Chitrapu, paragraph [0048], emphasis added.

Again, nowhere does the above-cited portion of *Chitrapu* describe that a number was derived from the slot synchronization for determining the number of frames for acquiring frame synchronization as claimed by Applicants. *Chitrapu* simply describes to accumulate correlations until a confidence *Limit* is reached. There is no description, or suggestion, in *Chitrapu* of determining a number to use during frame synchronization as a function of a correlation value from slot synchronization as claimed by Applicants.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 14 are patentable over *Lim* in view of *Chitrapu*. As such, dependent claims 2, 6, 7 and 16 are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lim* in view of *Chitrapu* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0045299 published March 6, 2003 for New (*New*). Applicants respectfully traverse for the reasons described above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 9-11 and 17-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lim* in view of *Chitrapu* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0161020 published August 19, 2004 for Mathew et al. (*Mathew*). Applicants respectfully traverse for the reasons described above with respect to independent claims 1 and 14.

As it is believed that all of the objections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' attorney in order to overcome any additional objections that the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefor.

Respectfully submitted
Louis Robert Litwin et al.

By____/Joseph J. Opalach/_____

Joseph J. Opalach
Registration No.: 36,229
(609) 734-6839

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC.

P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
February 8, 2010